

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,822	11/21/2003	Jan Chipchase	088245-1060	1339
23524 FOLEV & LA	23524 7590 07/31/2908 EXAMINER FOLEY & LARDNER LLP			IINER
150 EAST GILMAN STREET P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 5370I-1497			PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1100701 1107		2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/718,822		CHIPCHASE, JAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2132	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. \(\times \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other endone, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later then SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner hote: (1 box is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL RELECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The table on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is actualised from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
The Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
AFFIDANT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. Sea 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 cFR 43(3)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. \(\overline{\text{Z}}\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \(\overline{\text{See Continuation Sheet.}}\)
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)

/Benjamin E Lanier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues the independent claims and some of the dependent claims. The Examiner will rebut them here.

Starting with the independent claims, the Applicant argues that the office has failed to show the receiving specifications of physical form factor.

Want discloses the augment of RFID tags to several items based on user's wishes see page 371 SYSTEM OVERVIEW par. 1 & Page 372 SOME SAMPLE APPLICATIONS AND PROTOTYPES. And further Want discusses several factors in chosing the right tags for applications, e.g. unobtrusiveness(physical shape of tags), robustness(wear and tear due to normal use) see Page 372 Unobtrusiveness & Robustness.

Next the Applicant argues that dependent claims 19 and 54, the Office has failed to show access restrictions for virtual entity.

Want discloses the ID tags being associated with a user/computer and being mapped to a database to limit access to documents see Page 376 Software Infrastructure Par, 2.

Another dependent claim the Applicant argues is Claim 20 and 21, the Office has failed to show receiing payment for physical entity.

Want discloses the assocaiting a set actions with a tags that a administrator must mainatain in a file, which can include a payment for physical entity see Page 372 Associating Functionality.

Even further, the Applicant argues that the Office has failed to show limitations of Claim 70, that is physical entity provisioning hardware is absent.

Want discloses the provsioning hardware by registering with the database see Page 372 Par 3.

And finally, the Applicant discusses Claim 73 and 76, the Office has failed to show a computer vending machine.

Want discloses many implementations including a computer see Page 376 Harware Integration & Page 375 PhotoCube.